



FEEDBACK ON EDUCATION STRATEGIES IN ADOLESCENT SCHOOL GOING CHILDREN

Dr. Sreeparvathy M.

Vocational Teacher, GVHSS, Attingal, Trivandrum – Kerala, India.

ABSTRACT

Various methods are adapted in schools for teaching adolescents. This study aims in the response of these category on corporal punishments, repeated learning and suspension from class. The ambience preference of classroom and reaction to examination. A survey was carried out in 50 adolescents after explaining the questionnaire. The students prefer corporal punishment, though it is abandoned; they want to study in a smart class room than a traditional chalk board type. According to students, exams promote learning, while a very few suggested, exams lead to tension and depression.

INTRODUCTION

Behaviour of teacher, class room ambience and examining the students has significant implication on students' learning behaviour. In the present study a survey was conducted to assess the response of adolescents to various punishment methods adopted in schools in India. It discusses about students' need of study materials and reaction to frequent examinations from a students' point of view. Attitude of students towards learning depends upon many factors such as classroom environment, teacher attitude, curriculum and resources. According to Daskalogianni and Simpson (2000) attitude towards learning means the pattern of students' beliefs and emotions associated with classroom environment. Hannulla (2002) found that students' performance, efficacy, motivation and achievement in different subjects are essentially related to their attitude towards learning.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Among 50 adolescent students a survey was carried out asking about which punishment lead them to correct mistakes and improve learning. Type of class room they prefer and whether examinations improve learning ability. The answers are expressed as percentage and compared.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

In the present study it was interesting to note that about 70% of students prefer corporal punishment like beating, rather than writing the portion for repeated times or suspending the students from the class for a period of time. About 24% suggested suspending from class lead to better understanding of their mistakes, while only 6% suggested that repeated writing of answers promotes learning. Advocates of corporal punishment in schools generally contend that it is an effective form of correcting child misbehaviour (Straus et al). However, a review of the science in this area leads to the conclusion that corporal punishment is an ineffective method of discipline and has major deleterious effects on the physical and mental health of those on whom it is inflicted (Gershoff et al and Greydanus et al). Donald E. G. strongly believed that the use of corporal punishment in the school environment falsely and perfidiously reinforces physical aggression as an acceptable and effective means of eliminating unwanted behaviour in the society.

According to a behavioural study conducted by Thobias et al in humans only the group in which reward was given showed enhanced implicit learning; although the punished group also learned they did not do any better than the control subjects. According to Arif and Rafi the students who were awarded corporal punishment on creating a source of friction and showing lack of interest in their academic work began to show negative behaviour and their academic progress showed a gradual regression, whereas the students who were managed with psychological treatment developed their interest in learning, reflected friendly behaviour and improved their long-term scholastic performance. Joseph (1987) suggested that once focused on obtaining reward, extraverts and psychopaths display an active behaviour as opposed to a passive reaction to punishment and frustrating non reward. Reaction to punishment appears to interfere with learning cues for punishment and may underlie the poor passive avoidance learning and impulsive behaviour that characterize the syndromes of disinhibition.

As per review of literatures, no study could be seen on comparing the punishments like beating, suspension and imposition writing. From the present survey, it was concluded that students like small corporal punishments like beating, but further research on how to improve studies and correct mistakes are to be done. The present response is only a comparison between the three mode of punishments. The response can be due to no wastage of time for beating, while another two leads to wastage of time.

About 72% students prefer to study in smart class rooms, with hi-tech facilities and power point presentations. Remaining 28% prefer chalk board type class room. In a study conducted by Hitesh et al (2013) in medical college in North India find out 44.9% students like the traditional technique of teaching whereas 51.7% students like the power point while only 3.4% students like OHP by their teachers to present their lectures. 64% students find more concentration and less distraction and 71.42% finds their class mates more attentive and least disturbing to them during traditional way of teaching. He concluded that regardless of the teaching aid used the impact of a lecture depends on the teacher. Teachers should guide without dictating, and participate without dominating.

Priyadarshini et al (2012) suggested, when individual teaching aids are considered blackboard teaching aid is most satisfied because students can follow the teaching and understand the concept effectively. Judicious use of different methods increases the understanding, remembrance and reproducibility and thus the academic performance of the students. Combination Teaching aid is most satisfied Teaching aid because the inherent deficiency of one aid is compensated by the other. Hitesh et al (2013) felt that students are more oriented to topic, with chalk and talk technique as compared to PPT. But both traditional and new methods have some pros and cons. PPT is ideal for fast revision and quick overview of the subject and for seminars.

Eighty percent students suggest examinations improve learning, while 20% suggest examinations lead to tension and depression. In a study done by Roopakulkarni et al (2011), students suggested that questioning in the class room is not only helpful for better understanding of the concept but also helps in developing communication skills. According to Priyadarshini et al (2012) Combination of teaching preceded and followed by asking questions, small group discussions and assessment tests is most satisfied teaching method because the student is actively involved and more learning takes place. Some early researchers (Jones, 1923) expected great benefits from classroom testing, but others (Noll, 1939) complained about possible negative effects from too much testing. Several studies have reported increased stress in students during the time of examinations (Takatsuji, 2008; Johansson, 1988; Lucini, 2002).

REFERENCES

1. Arif M. S. and Rafi M. S. (2007) Effects of corporal punishment and psychological treatment on students' learning and behaviour. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*. 3(2):171-180.
2. Daskalogianni, K., & Simpson, A. (2000). Towards a Definition of Attitude: the Relationship between the Affective and the Cognitive in Pre-university Students. *Proceedings of PME*, 24(2), 170-184.
3. Donald E. G. (2010) Testimony on "Corporal Punishment in Schools and its Effect on Academic Success". Michigan State University/Kalamazoo Centre for Medical Studies.
4. Gershoff E.T. Bitensky S.H. (2007) The case against corporal punishment of children: Converging evidence from social science research and international human rights law and implications for U.S. public policy. *Psychology, Public Policy and Law*. Nov. 13(4): 231-272.
5. Greydanus D.E., Pratt H.D., Spates C.R., Blake-Dreher A.E., Greydanus-Gearhart M.A., Patel D. R. (2003) Corporal punishment: Position Statement of Society for Adolescent Medicine. *J Adolescent Health*. 32:385-393.
6. Hannula, M. (2002). Attitude toward Mathematics: Emotions, Expectations, and Values. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 49, 22-29.
7. Hitesh M., Vipin K., Pankaj K. M., (2013) Comparison of different teaching methodologies in a Medical college in North India. *Indian Journal of Basic & Applied Medical Research*, 6(2):464-469.
8. Jones, H. E. (1923). Experimental studies of college teaching: The effect of examina-

- tion on permanence of learning. *Archives of Psychology*, 10, 1-70.
9. Johansson G.G., Laakso M.L., Peder M., Karonen S.L. (1988) Examination stress decreases plasma level of luteinizing hormone in male students. *Psychosom Med.* 50:286-94.
 10. Joseph P. N. (1987) , Reaction to punishment in extraverts and psychopaths: Implications for the impulsive behaviour of disinhibited individuals *Journal of Research in Personality*. 21 (4):464-481.
 11. Lucini D., Norbiato G., Clerici M., Pagani M. (2002) Hemodynamic and autonomic adjustments to real life stress conditions in humans. *Hypertension*. 39:184-8.
 12. Noll, V. H. (1939). The effect of written tests upon achievement in college classes: An experiment and a summary of evidence. *Journal of Educational Research*, 32, 345-358.
 13. Priyadarshini. K. S, H. V. Shetty, Reena. R. (2012) Assessment of different teaching aids and teaching methods for the better perception of biochemistry by 1st mbbs students. *Journal of Evolution of Medical and Dental Sciences*. 1(6): 1159-1169
 14. Roopakulkarni, Ashwini. C.A, Bharath Reddy. (2011). "Student Perception on Lectures in Medical Education. *Anatomica Karnataka*, 5 (2) 01-13.
 15. Straus M.A., Mouradian V.E. (1998) Impulsive corporal punishment by mothers and antisocial behaviour and impulsiveness of children. *BehavSci Law*. 16:353-374.
 16. Takatsuji K., Sugimoto Y., Ishizaki S., Ozaki Y., Matsuyama E., Yamaguchi Y. (2008) The effects of examination stress on salivary cortisol, immunoglobulin A, and chromogranin A in nursing students. *Biomed Res*. 29:221-4.
 17. Tobias W., Ovidiu V. L., Tao L., Daniel T.W. and James A. (2009) Differential Effect of Reward and Punishment on Procedural Learning. *J. of Neuroscience* 29 (2): 436-443.